

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated March 22, 2006. Claims 1-17 are pending in the instant application.

Claims 1-14

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1-14 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if modified to overcome the Section 112, second paragraph, rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to address and overcome the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection. The claim has been amended to clarify that the phrase at issue is discussing the seal when the sliding panel is in the closed position.

Claim 5 has also been amended to address and overcome the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection. The phrase "and/or" has been removed, although the applicant does agree with or acquiesce to the rejection. Because cut-outs are a sub-set of apertures (apertures is a broad term which covers, *inter alia*, cut-outs), the scope of the claim has not been changed.

Because the Section 112 rejections of claims 1 and 5 have been addressed and overcome, claims 1-14 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 15

Claim 15 stands rejected under Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Wenner '191 in view of Kelly. This Section 103(a) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 15 requires that "at least one of the first and second appliqués includes a main body portion comprising a first polymer based material and an abutting portion comprising a second polymer based material that is softer than the first polymer based material, wherein the

abutting portion of the appliqué which comprises the softer material is located at an edge of the appliqué and abuts a corresponding peripheral edge of at least one of the fixed window panels; and wherein substantially the entire abutting portion of the appliqué is coplanar with the fixed window panel that the abutting portion abuts.” E.g., see Fig. 10 of the instant application.

Wenner ‘191 and Kelly fails to disclose or suggest this feature. In Fig. 5 of Wenner, it is clear that no portion of the alleged appliqué abuts a peripheral edge of the fixed window panel 32.

Moreover, it is clear from Fig. 5 of Wenner that substantially the entire alleged abutting portion of the alleged appliqué cannot possibly be “coplanar” with fixed window panel 32. Wenner is entirely unrelated to the invention of claim 15 in each of these two respects. Citation to Kelly cannot cure these fundamental flaws of Wenner.

Conclusion

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.

By: _____

Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100